


INFORMATION
FOR
PROHIBITION WORKERS

ONTARIO
PLEBISCITE CAMPAIGN

October 23, 1924



ISSUED BY
THE BOARD OF HOME MISSIONS AND
SOCIAL SERVICE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN CANADA



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2017 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/informationforpr00pres>

**THE QUESTIONS TO BE SUBMITTED IN ONTARIO
ON OCTOBER 23RD, 1924, are:**

1. "Are you in favor of the continuance of the Ontario Temperance Act?"
 2. "Are you in favor of the sale as a beverage, of beer and spirituous liquor in sealed packages under Government Control?"
-

The questions submitted in British Columbia on
October 20th, 1920, were:

Which do you prefer—

- (1) "The present Prohibition Act?"

or

- (2) "An Act to provide for Government Control and sale in sealed packages of spirituous and malt liquors?"
-

It is plain that the questions submitted in Ontario and British Columbia are the same in substance. Consequently, the repudiation of the present Ontario Temperance Act, and the approval of Question Two, on October 23rd, will make possible in Ontario the unhappy moral and industrial conditions which now prevail in British Columbia.

Information for Prohibition Workers

Ontario Plebiscite, October 23rd, 1924

A. FACTS AND EVIDENCE, NOT RUMORS AND SOPHISTRY

Population.

	1911.	1921.
(1) Ontario	2,572,292	2,933,662
Quebec	2,005,776	2,361,199
British Columbia	392,480	524,582

(2) The "Financial Post" (Toronto) on June 29, 1923, gave the following as the Debt of the Provinces:

	Date	Gross Debt	Net Funded Debt	Contingent Liabilities
Ontario—	Oct. 31	\$238,836,336	\$88,753,800	\$54,557,574
Per Capita	1922	81.42	30.25	
Quebec—	June 30	55,602,926	52,725,252	3,102,500
Per Capita	1922	23.54	22.30	
British Columbia—	Jan. 15	82,086,311	58,700,793	45,100,542
Per Capita	1923	156.47	112.09	

(3) The "Financial Post" on July 25, 1924, gave the following as showing growth of Provincial Expenditures:

	Ontario.	Quebec.	British Columbia.
1920.....	\$25,880,843	\$13,520,740	\$11,568,003
1921.....	25,579,687	14,624,088	15,236,941
1922.....	37,442,986	16,575,977	17,346,487
1923.....	49,305,439	20,190,275	17,677,330

(4) Government Liquor Stores

- (a) In B.C., March 31, 1922—51 Stores
 March 31, 1923—65 Stores
 March 31, 1924—71 Stores

(b) In Quebec, the "Montreal Witness" of December 5, 1923, states:

"There are 82 Government Stores operating in the Province. There are 1,906 licensed places, such as taverns, groceries, hotels, restaurants, clubs, breweries and steamers. In all 1,988 places where liquor can be purchased according to law—80 times as many as in 1919. The figures for Montreal are: 35 Government stores, 248 taverns, 588 groceries, 47 restaurants, 28 clubs, 56 hotels, 3 breweries and 6 steamboats—a total of 976 places—51 times as many as there were in 1919—

and this is Government Control!"

AMOUNT OF SALES

(5) The first Annual Report of the Quebec Liquor Commission states on page 34:

For the year ending April 30, 1922

Sales—Hard Liquor	\$15,212,801.21
Net Trading Profits	\$2,860,010.64
Add revenue from fines, duties, permits and seizures	1,140,963.86
Net Revenue	<u>\$4,000,974.50</u>

Page 22 gives amount of Beer sold:

22,321,348 gallons. Value of sales \$15,517,953.97

Quebec's drink bill for the year was 30,730,755.18

The second Annual Report of the Quebec Liquor Commission states on page 16:

For the year ending April 30, 1923

Sales \$19,698,773.04

Net Trading Profit	\$3,078,258.03
Add revenue from fines, duties, permits and seizures	1,236,497.78

Net Revenue	\$4,314,755.81
-------------------	----------------

Page 27 gives the amount of Beer sold:

22,576,357 gallons. Value of sales \$13,763,627.47

Quebec's drink bill for the year was 33,462,400.51

The drop in amount received for Beer was due to excise tax being reduced from 30 cents a gallon to 12½ cents on May 23, 1922.

Note that with an increased consumption of Beer amounting to 255,009 gallons, the consumption of hard liquor increased \$4,485,971.83.

Note that sale of Beer in Quebec was:

1920-1.....	6,409,189 gallons
1921-2.....	22,321,348 “
1922-3.....	22,576,357 “

Note amount from fines, permits and seizures.

How about the “Control”?

SALES IN GOVERNMENT STORES IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

On October 20, 1920, British Columbia decided to change from Prohibition to Moderation, in order to stop bootlegging, increase respect for law, reduce taxation, attract desirable citizens, protect homes, and assist business men to meet their liabilities.

RESULTS

The newspapers claim that bootlegging was never as prevalent as now. The Attorney-General states that the present (Moderation) law is nowhere respected or enforced.

Taxation in the Municipalities, and in the Province, has steadily increased.

VANCOUVER SALES

From June 15, 1921, to September 30th, 1923, the seven Government Liquor Stores in Vancouver received for the sale of liquor, \$8,318,786.18. This amount does not include anything from the sale of Permits, which, from June 15th, 1921, to September 30th, 1922, amounted to \$155,761.50; or a little over \$10,000 a month. Out of the \$8,318,786.18, Vancouver received back in so-called "profits," \$642,502.16. To get a dollar back Vancouver pays out over \$13.00 for booze. This illustrates the value of the Moderationists' much vaunted plan for reducing taxation. Will the business men of Vancouver inform us how much they got out of the balance of \$7,676,284.00? Had it been spent in Vancouver, to what extent would business have been benefited?

DRINKING OURSELVES RICH

There has been little change in the platform of the Moderation Leagues during the past four years. In 1920 the voters of British Columbia were being told that under Government Sale of Liquors, "Bootlegging would automatically cease, taxes would be reduced, respect for law would be restored, roads would be built, etc., etc." The voters of Ontario are now listening to the same siren song.

FACTS ABOUT BRITISH COLUMBIA

From June 15th, 1921, when Government Sale began in British Columbia, to September 30th, 1923, according to the British Columbia Government Reports, the sales in the Government Stores amounted to \$21,393,872, and the Municipalities received back in so-called "profits," \$1,537,789.

The Vancouver papers have repeatedly claimed that bootlegging is so prevalent that the Government in its 71 Liquor Stores is not selling one-half of what

is consumed. Page 34 of the last Report of the Liquor Control Board, states that from October, 1922, to April, 1923, the Government spent \$14,403 per month in Secret Service expenses. This is at the rate of \$172,836 per year. The Government, though in the Liquor Business, finds it impossible to stamp out bootlegging, and secure a monopoly.

EFFECT ON BUSINESS

According to the "Vancouver Province" of November 27, 1922: "Of every \$4.00 paid by a purchaser for liquor at a Government Store, \$1.25 stays in the Province, \$1.00 goes to Scotland, while \$1.75 goes to the Federal Government, and to the Railways. This was an estimate given to the Public Accounts Committee this morning at Victoria by Mr. Archie Johnson, Chairman of the Liquor Control Board." This means that out of every dollar paid at a Government Liquor Store, 69 cents goes out of the Province, and is no longer available for business purposes in the Province.

On August 24th, 1923, the Convention of British Columbia Municipalities, meeting in Prince Rupert, unanimously passed this resolution:

"That this Convention places itself on record as strongly protesting against the present disgraceful situation throughout the Province in regard to the formation of Clubs, and the sale of Liquor; that the present situation is worse than in the days of the open bar, and is not only destructive of the morals of the people, but is resulting in bringing about general contempt for law and order; that the Government be urged at the earliest possible moment to consider this situation, and enact laws to alter this deplorable state of affairs."

The British Columbia Prohibition Act was not well enforced, but during its slackest enforcement, social

and business conditions were better than the best conditions under Government Sale. Government booze has just the same effect as that of any other vendor, and under its malign influence it is just as difficult for the individual to drink himself rich.

This is a Time to Think—Not to Drink

HISTORIC REFERENCE

The taunt is made that Province after Province has repudiated the principle of Prohibition. This ought not to occasion great surprise. In the struggle against a legalized liquor traffic both in the United States and in our own Provinces, there has always been an ebb and flow. Forty years ago the Scott Act was adopted by two-thirds of the Counties in the Province of Ontario. A reaction set in, and nearly all these Counties repudiated it, setting up the old license system. Then came Local Option, by which cities, towns and villages sought to outlaw the liquor business. A three-fifths majority was necessary to accomplish this, but once the veto was established, a three-fifths majority was necessary to repeal it. Steadily the area under local veto was increased, until at last the forces opposed to the traffic were able to secure the present Ontario Temperance Act. In the States the history of the struggle was similar. Between 1846 and 1855, fourteen States adopted Prohibition. By the first decade of the present century, thirteen of these had gone back to some form of legalized sale. Maine adopted Prohibition in 1846; repealed it in 1856, and re-enacted it in 1858. Massachusetts passed a similar law in 1852; repealed it in 1868; re-enacted it in 1869, and repealed it in 1875. So it has gone, but the tide against the Liquor Traffic in America rose higher and higher, until to-day the 18th Amendment exists, bringing National Prohibition into force, and the amendment is in very little danger of being repealed.

BOOTLEGGING IN QUEBEC

During the debates of 1922 in the Senate at Ottawa, Senator Hon. Mr. Pope made the following statement:

"I never listened to more extravagant language and misrepresentation of facts than I have heard this afternoon with regard to the situation in Quebec. We never had any bootlegging in Quebec, nor cause for any until we had the present law. It is useless to say it has done away with bootlegging—it **has created it**. As to elimination of intoxication, it is no use telling that to me—we have more illicit stills in Quebec than you gentlemen had hair on your heads before you began to shed any. As to the statement that the Government of Quebec has made a success out of their Liquor Act, I regret exceedingly to say it is not correct."

More vice, more crime, more cruelty, more insanity, more degradation and more misery result from the operation of the Liquor Traffic than from any other cause. Ramsay Macdonald, M.P., was right when he said: "There is nothing that damps down and finally smothers out the happy domestic fire more effectively than drink." Knowing the ravages of drink, Christian men and women in the interest of their fellows, and for the protection of their homes, are compelled to organize that they may destroy such a traffic.

SUGGESTION FOR ADVERTISEMENT

"THEY SAY"

The wet moderates and the moderate wets have
one cure for everything. It is

"MORE BOOZE"

They say:

Drunkenness has increased.

Their Cure—

"More Booze"

They say:

Crime has increased.

Their Cure—

"More Booze"

They say:

Bootlegging is rampant.

Their Cure—

"More Booze"

They say:

Prohibition destroys personal liberty.

Revive it with—

"More Booze"

They say:

Taxes will be reduced.

How? By selling—"More Booze"

They say:

The worker is discontented.

Their Cure—

Souce him with—"More Booze"

THIS WILL MEAN A DELUGE OF BOOZE

THIS IS A TIME TO THINK—NOT DRINK

VOTE FOR THE O. T. A.

B. COMMUNITY INTERESTS, NOT INDIVIDUAL DESIRES

SASKATCHEWAN

On September 2nd, 1924, the Moderation League of Saskatchewan presented their views on Law to be enacted in Saskatchewan. "The Regina Leader" of September 3rd, reports Premier Dunning as follows: "Much has been said regarding the question of cheap liquor. When you appeared before the Government previously one of your planks was to use the profits from any Government Control system for the relief of Taxation, and all that sort of thing. You have dropped that to-day . . . I have never known of a people **drinking themselves rich**, and certainly have never known of a community of any kind that **drank itself into low taxes**. The matter of revenue will not be of prime importance to the Government."

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Dr. Ernest Hall, Victoria Police Commissioner, had this to say of Government Sale, at Victoria on September 7th, 1923:

"In place of the administration of the Liquor Control Act in behalf of the welfare of our citizens, we find a persistent policy upon the part of the Government to increase the sale of Liquor. In fact the Government set out upon a policy of alcoholizing our people for profit, of saturation rather than control."—Victoria Times, September 8, 1923.

MANITOBA

"Police are prepared to admit that liquor is being sold in hundreds of suites and homes in this city, and they are powerless to do anything."—Winnipeg Free Press, November 1, 1923.

“The police admit that certain hotels are still running, and are not only selling Beer now, but in most cases Whiskey.”—Winnipeg Free Press, February 7, 1924.

“What is the remedy for the situation that exists in Winnipeg in regard to the wide-open violation of the Liquor Control Act—the operation of Bars just as in former days, where beer can be obtained by the glass, and usually hard liquor also? How is it law enforcement has broken down and the bars have re-opened, paying periodic fines, instead of the former licenses and keeping open? Those who operate the Bars must have an important source of supply. How do they manage to get enough stock in trade to carry on such a large business? This a rather vital question! The most of it they obtain from the Breweries. The hard liquor they obtain from Permit Holders, who have purchased it from the Government Stores. Do the Brewing Companies know they are supplying beer for illicit sale at the Bars? Yes, without the remotest doubt.”—Winnipeg Free Press, August 12, 1924.

In 1920, Vancouver City with a population of one-fifth of Toronto, was under Prohibition. In 1923 it was under Government Sale. The following report of Sales in Vancouver in 1920 and in 1923 is taken from Government reports:

	1920	1923
July	\$8,302.63	\$327,381.42
August	9,643.01	349,693.59
September	10,849.04	348,554.97
October	12,869.32	345,992.73
November	12,744.63	344,806.23
December	20,070.22	629,847.91
Totals	<hr/> \$74,478.85	<hr/> \$2,346,276.85

Though Vancouver has a very large auto tourist traffic during the summer months, notice how little it effects the volume of sale. There are three Government Liquor Stores on the Pacific highway between Vancouver and the border. Note that under Government Sale in a period of 6 months, a city of 120,000 increased the expenditure for liquor in 3 years from \$74,000 to \$2,346,000. Vancouver's drink bill at its 7 Government Stores is now \$4,500,000 a year, and the bootleggers sell an equal amount. Common sense will recognize the effect that results to the community life and the business life, when consumption of liquor is so increased. It is to be remembered that under Government Sale the Government that punishes the intoxicated man is the same Government that sells him the liquor. Enforcement of liquor laws under Prohibition and under Government Sale are two very different things.

GOVERNMENT SALE AND BUSINESS

R. G. Dun & Co. report business failures in British Columbia as follows:

Under Prohibition—

1918	40
1919	42
1920	64

Under Government Sale—

1921	125
1922	162
1923	162

R. G. Dun & Co. report business failures in Ontario and in Quebec as follows:

1923—

	Failures	Liabilities
Ontario	844	\$14,174,683
Quebec	1,171	30,969,750

1924 (1st Quarter)—

Ontario	255	\$9,680,925
Quebec	277	8,634,258

The assets in Ontario, however, exceeded Quebec by \$4,415,345.

1924 (2nd Quarter)—

	Failures	Liabilities
Ontario	199	\$3,293,101
Quebec	163	4,087,629

The assets in Ontario exceeded Quebec by \$184,023.

POLICE FORCE

The "Vancouver Province," of August 21, 1924, quotes the Mayor of that City as follows:

"I have been studying this matter closely during the past few months and have come to the conclusion that notwithstanding increased cost, the citizens have a right to expect to be protected in an adequate manner, and I am in favor of increasing the police so that they can deal properly with the situation."

The "Winnipeg Tribune," of August 13, 1924, states:

"Statistics from the City Police for the past five months show the following convictions for drunkenness: March, 153; April, 146; May, 163; June, 133; July, 142; an increase of 253 over the same five months of 1923."

TAXATION

We have the taxation papers on a house and lot in the residential section of Vancouver. With the assessment the same each year, taxes paid were: 1919, \$62.99; 1920, \$68.19; 1921, \$78.06; 1922, \$101.61; 1923, \$106.69; 1924, \$140.65.

The following answers were given by manufacturers to questions asked them by the Ontario Board of License Commissioners:

1. Are you of the opinion that Prohibition under the Ontario Temperance Act makes for increased production of goods?

1,047, or 72%, answered Yes, and
393, or 27%, answered No.

2. Does it increase the workers' regularity of attendance immediately after pay day?

1,094, or 76%, answered Yes, and
341, or 23%, answered No.

3. Does it improve their capacity for work, and their ability to perform their duties?

1,070, or 74%, answered Yes, and
371, or 25%, answered No.

4. Does it result in more comfortable homes and better supplies of food and clothing for wives and children?

1,165, or 82%, answered Yes, and
239, or 17%, answered No.

5. Are drunkenness and poverty as common now under the Ontario Temperance Act as formerly under the open bar, and the Liquor License Act?

1,413, or 85%, answered No, and
241, or 14%, answered Yes.

The following are the replies of School Inspectors to the Questionnaire of the Ontario Board of License Commissioners in 1923:

1. Has the Ontario Temperance Act made an appreciable improvement in school attendance?

99, or 76%, answered Yes, and
30, or 23%, answered No.

Some of those who answered "No" say that they previously had Prohibition under Local Option, so the change was not noticeable.

2. Has it improved the home surroundings of the children?

158, or 94%, answered Yes, and
9, or 5%, answered No.

3. Has it improved their opportunities for obtaining an education?

159, or 94%, answered Yes, and
10, or 5%, answered No.

4. Has it resulted in their better education?

147, or 94%, answered Yes, and
10, or 6%, answered No.

5. In your opinion would a return to License be undesirable?

142, or 80%, answered Yes, and
34, or 19%, answered No.

"I have several pupils who are attending the High School who could not if the parents had access to drink."

"Many whose clothing was bad, who were under-nourished, whose attendance was irregular, improved in every particular when the Act came into force."

"Booze is the enemy of the school."

"In my opinion a return to License would be a calamity to our country."

WHY STATISTICS ON DRUNKENNESS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA ARE LOW

"Mr. S. C. Burton, Police Commissioner, is authority for the statement before the City Council, that it is

not part of the policy of the Commission to arrest every drunk on the street; the police, he emphasized, have instructions to see such cases to their homes, if they can walk at all and are not obstreperous. If all the drunks were arrested," he declared, "there would be no room for them in the City jail."—From Editorial, Kamloops, B.C., Sentinel, August 8, 1924.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN CANADA

In view of the situation regarding unemployment in Ontario, voters should carefully consider the result of the vote on October 23rd. Increasing the volume of Liquor, and, as a consequence, the amount of money spent in its purchase, would but aggravate the situation. On September the 4th, 1924, the "Mail and Empire" reported a meeting at Ottawa, as follows:

"From Halifax to Vancouver representatives of Provinces and Municipalities recited to-day in the Dominion Unemployment Conference the distress due to unemployment, and their fears of an aggravation of this situation in the coming months. From every City and Province came the same story of abnormal unemployment."

The Liquor Bill of British Columbia is now about twenty million dollars a year, and that of Quebec about forty million dollars annually. The result is the liquor trade is thriving at the expense of other trades. Money spent on liquor is not spent on food, clothing, furniture or education. The business of the Brewers and Distillers cannot compare with that of the manufacturing and distributing the necessities and comforts of life in the matter of giving employment to those out of work.

The "Globe" of September 1st, 1924, had this to say on "**Liquor and Business**": "Manufacturers, mechanics and merchants will make a great mistake if they

imagine that a revival of the Liquor Trade will improve their business. It will have the opposite effect. The Retail Merchant who votes for the Bar or the Government Distributing Agency will be setting up a rival to himself. The wholesaler and manufacturer, mechanic and farmer will suffer by the same competition. Economically the issue is between the liquor business and all other business. The liquor interest is fighting for its own, as might be expected. But it will have cause to be hugely amused if it can enlist on its side those from whom it is seeking to divert business, and cause salaries and wages to be spent more on intoxicants and less on the necessities and comforts which our farmers and mechanics are producing."

That is a good law which reduces crime, promotes health, wealth, happiness and the morality of a people. Even the limited amount of Prohibition which Canada enjoys at the present time has succeeded in doing this. The proof is found in the results secured, for example:

1. HEALTH:

Statistics show that fewer children die in places where the smallest quantities of intoxicating liquors are consumed. The rate of infant mortality in the Province of Ontario, in 1913, was 117 per thousand. In 1922 it fell to 63 per thousand, a reduction of 46%. In the City of Toronto in 1913 infant mortality was at the rate of 119 per thousand. In 1923 it fell to 63 per thousand, a reduction of 47%. Dr. C. M. Crawford, who has handled mental cases for eight years in the Ontario Hospital for the Insane at Whitby, said: "As a result of the inability of the majority of people to get alcohol now, the mental disorders due to alcohol have practically disappeared, and in the last three years I have not seen one case of alcoholic mental disorder."

2. WEALTH:

The savings of the children in the Public Schools of Toronto in 1916 were \$190,000. In 1923 they had risen to \$430,000. The Savings Deposits for the Dominion in 1913 were \$626,199,470. In 1923 they had risen to \$1,218,295,721.

3. HAPPINESS:

Shoe Dealers say: "We are selling shoes to-day for children belonging to homes where poverty caused by drink kept the children bare-footed." Grocers say: "We have customers who could not pay their bills while the pay cheque was cashed at the bar, but who to-day are buying more and better food, and who pay their accounts promptly."

4. MORALITY:

The quantity of intoxicating liquor consumed by the people of Canada in 1913 was 9 pints per head. In 1922 it was only 3 pints per head. The number of convictions per ten thousand of the population for drunkenness in 1923 was 8. In 1922 it was slightly less than 3.

The liquor trade, through the Moderation League, ascribed this improvement to the diffusion of education, the growing refinement of manners, and the economic argument for sobriety. It contends that these agencies alone can cure the evils arising from the abuse of liquor. Legislation, they assert, has done and can do nothing in this direction, because it cannot change the inveterate habits or nature of the people. The "trade" conveniently forgets the fact that the general improvement of conditions have marched hand in hand with legislative restrictions of the liquor traffic, which became more and more severe year by year.

A study of legislation wherein personal liberty has been limited by statute shows that these limitations have been strongly challenged, for example: compulsory education, game laws, anti-gambling laws, etc. Nevertheless these restrictions are here to stay. Certainly the legal advances against the liquor trade have been vigorously contested by those interested in the traffic. The "trade" fought a reduction in the number of licensed places, lessening the hours in which drink could be sold. They opposed the principle of Local Option. When the "Banish the Bar" movement was in progress, the "trade" fought it with all their strength. Now that the campaign is being waged for the complete prohibition of the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquor for beverage purposes, the "trade" throughout the world is united in a "last ditch" encounter.

C. MORAL ISSUES, NOT ECONOMIC VALUES

Fundamentally Prohibition is a moral question, and any method of handling liquor must be judged by its effect on the social and moral life of the people. In the Western Provinces a Publicity Campaign, backed by unlimited expenditure of money, represents Government Sale as a better Temperance measure than Prohibition. Respect for law would be restored, with better moral conditions, bootlegging would automatically cease, schools and hospitals would be built, etc.

MORAL RESULTS

On June 16, 1921, Permit No. 28029 was issued at the Powell Street Store, Vancouver, to Mrs. Elizabeth Magness. In 86 days from that date (12 Sundays no sale) this woman bought 13 bottles of Scotch, 70 bottles of Rum, and 1,962 bottles of Beer. On October 11, 1923, Hon. Harry Stevens, speaking in Vancouver,

quoted the case of a man named McGivern, who in 30 days received 96 barrels of Beer. A barrel contains 120 bottles.

From March, 1921, to September, 1922, another man purchased from Government Stores in Vancouver, \$35,183.50 worth of liquor. We have photographs of cheques made out to the Government Vendor, showing following daily sales:

\$184.00, \$151.00, \$168.00, \$125.50, \$140.00, \$117.00, \$400.00, \$268.00, \$400.00, \$142.50, \$134.00, \$134.00.

The Vancouver Police Court records show that in 1918, under Prohibition, there were convictions of 76 bawdy house keepers, and of 188 men and women found therein. In 1922, under Government Sale, there were convictions of 197 "keepers," and 746 men and women found therein. In 1923, 163 "keepers," and 814 men and women found therein. From January 1st, to July 31, 1924, 116 "keepers," and 668 men and women found therein. Intoxicating liquor is necessary for the maintenance of a vice area.

BOOTLEGGING

On June 17, 1924, the "Vancouver Province" stated editorially: "There is no thought any longer of moderation or decency in the business; there is a pretence of confining the sale of malt and hard liquors to Government Stores and sealed packages, but it is an open secret that both beer and spirits may be purchased in a hundred illicit Clubs in Vancouver, and these are allowed to flourish under the protection of the party machine. Party interest, party profit are the real considerations. There is no longer any question of Government Stores and sealed packages being anything like the sole source of supply in Vancouver."

On April 25, 1924, "The Hook" (Vancouver) asked: "Where is the flood of bootleg liquor coming from that is saturating the Clubs, the hotels, and liquor dives of Vancouver, Victoria, and Nanaimo? Not for a long time has there been such a deluge of illicit liquor in the Coast Cities as at present. . . We are convinced that bootlegging estimated at the extent of 5,000 cases a month is taking place in and around Vancouver."

Page 1256 of "Debates of the Senate" at Ottawa (June 27, 1923), states on the authority of the Department of Customs that from January 1, 1923, to June 25, 1923, the British Columbia Government imported 120,831 gallons and the British Columbia export houses in the same time 124,066 gallons of liquor.

During the Referenda in the West, there was a strong suspicion that the movement against Prohibition was not the result of disinterested action on the part of the Moderation League issuing from a patriotic desire to establish temperate habits among the people. It was felt that the brewers and distillers, not only in Canada and the United States, but those in Europe and the Old Land, were behind the attempt to re-establish the liquor trade in Canada. This suspicion has been confirmed by an extract from a report of the French Wines Exportation Company. It says: "The year 1923 will be reckoned in Canada as one of the most striking in the history of Prohibition; the anti-prohibitionist campaign, advancing from place to place, gained over two provinces, Manitoba and Alberta; two other provinces, Ontario and Saskatchewan, will soon yield to this effort. The Wines Exportation commission may lay claim to a preponderant share in this success as being the only French or Foreign organism which brought all its forces to bear in the battle. The President of the Council, Minister of Foreign Affairs, expressly intimated to it on this occasion his approval of

the efforts it pursues for the expansion. Our action assumed the most diverse forms: drawing up of tracts and pamphlets, editing of the latter and their distribution throughout Canada, press publication and controversies, FURNISHING THE FUNDS AT THE RIGHT MOMENT. Our activity did not confine itself to 'moistening' the dry provinces where it appeared the effort might be useful; it was likewise exercised in improving the regime existing in the provinces where this effort had already borne fruit by the institution of the intermediary system represented by the monopoly. We had, for instance, occasion to express our point of view to the French Government upon certain details of the working of the Quebec Liquor Commission, and quite recently we organized a campaign in British Columbia for the adoption of certain measures favourable to the sale of our productions."

A dangerous slogan has been devised, namely: "Save the boy from the bottle on the hip." This will require to be met vigorously. The success of the Moderation and Liberty League policy by which a number of Government Stores will be opened for the sale of intoxicating liquors, would increase the facilities for the boy to keep his bottle filled, if he were so inclined. Government sale as in British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba and Quebec, encourages the practice of carrying the bottle in the hip pocket. If this custom is recognized in Ontario think of the results of it:

- (1) In offices where women are employed,
- (2) In manufacturing places, with all the possibilities of accidents,
- (3) In homes and the consequences there,
- (4) In autos and the deaths that would follow.

Alcohol and gasoline are bad mixers.

"The Liquor traffic gets its life in the 'still' house and its hope of immortality in the still church."

SUGGESTION FOR ADVERTISEMENT

WHAT GOVERNMENT CONTROL WILL MEAN

1. Boozoriums everywhere.
2. Civil servants warehousing, shipping, and selling Booze.
3. Booze back into Politics.
4. The Government and the Liquor Trade dividing the profits of the people's degradation.
5. Bootlegging greatly increased.
6. Law enforcement paralyzed. The Government that sells the Booze is the Government that punishes the drinker.
7. Home, office and hotel life debauched.
8. Thousands robbed of their personal liberty by being coerced into a partnership with a degrading trade.
9. Taxes increased because of added expense of caring for drink addicts.
10. Unemployment increased.

THIS IS A TIME TO THINK—NOT DRINK

RESOLUTION BY MEN WHO KNOW CONDITIONS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

“In view of the persistent claims made throughout Canada that the system of Government Control in British Columbia has eliminated the evils formerly associated with the Liquor Traffic, the Presbytery of Westminster, B.C., deems it a duty to make known to

Prohibition workers and the general public, that in its judgment:

1. The quantity of liquor consumed is steadily increasing and has already reached alarming proportions.

2. The consequent deplorable results, such as bootlegging, bawdy houses, social immorality and lawlessness, as reflected in police court records, are rapidly becoming a menace to social stability.

3. The Traffic is exerting a corrupting influence in the political life of the Province, and is a growing menace to the legitimate exercise of constituted authority.

4. The large amount of money withdrawn from legitimate business is occasioning serious financial depression.

5. The evils of the present system are in proportion to the extent of the Traffic, but in addition are more flagrant and pernicious than under the former system, as the present system commercializes the Traffic and distributes the profits to the Government and Municipalities, thereby diverting the attention of the people from its essential evil to a selfish consideration.

The Presbytery, in view of all the facts, reaffirms its belief in the wisdom and policy of the General Assembly, which favours the Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic for beverage purposes, and urges ministers and congregations to adopt such educational methods as will adequately set forth the present deplorable situation, and prepare for a movement to free the Province from its baneful effects.

The Presbytery is of opinion that the recent vote on the Beer Plebiscite, in which the Moderationist vote

declined over 18,000, and the Prohibition vote increased over 18,000, is indicative of the growing conviction that the present system has falsified all the claims made on its behalf, and is condemned on its own record.

Unanimously adopted September 2nd, 1924."

REV. W. H. SMITH, D.D., PRINCIPAL OF WESTMINSTER HALL, VANCOUVER, UNDER DATE OF SEPT. 1st, 1924, EXPRESSED HIMSELF REGARDING CONDITIONS IN B.C. IN THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE:

"In reply to your request for my opinion concerning the moral, social and economic aspects of the system of Government Control of the Liquor Traffic in British Columbia, I wish to say that in my judgment the only difference between the present and the former system is that whereas formerly private individuals or saloon keepers handled the goods the Government is now the liquor dealer. It is only a difference of management.

"The pernicious effects of alcohol upon the human system, upon the degradation of morals and the destruction of economic resources, have all been scientifically investigated, and as far as I can see, the same results follow whether the liquor is taken from a tin mug or a gold goblet, whether handled by the bloated saloon keeper or the agent of the Government. The increasing quantity consumed, the increasing volume of crime, the wretched destruction of human values, and the distressing financial depression are all so vitally related to the present liquor traffic that no thoughtful person seriously questions them.

"There are two very serious aspects of Government Control. One is that it is a financial enterprise in which the profits are divided between the Government and the municipalities. This commercializing of human weaknesses and vices is more paralyzing to the moral sense of righteousness and brotherhood than anything associated with the saloon of the past. The other is its corrupting power in political and public life. This is assuming alarming proportions, and in proportion as the traffic grows in power, bribery and corruption flourish.

"Many felt that Government Control would be a real solution of this persistent social evil, and that the experiment would be justified. As far as I can judge the actual results conclusively show that the liquor traffic for beverage purposes can neither be adequately controlled nor made contributory to human well-being. The results leave no room to doubt that already the tide has turned and society again is facing the goal of social uprightness, the prohibition of a traffic whose history is its condemnation."

POSITION OF CHURCH

The time has come when the Church of God must definitely make up its mind under which flag it proposes to fight:

IS IT FOR DRINK OR AGAINST DRINK?

The Church must answer the question: Is the indictment against alcohol for beverage purposes proved, or not proved? Is the case made out by science true, or untrue? Is the case made by the economist true, or untrue? Is the case made by lovers of humanity, and particularly of children, true or untrue? Is Sir James

Crichton Browne, M.D., speaking the truth when he says:

“The misdeeds of Alcohol are conspicuous enough. It is obviously responsible alone, or in combination with other malign agencies, for much poverty, misery and sorrow, for matrimonial wreckage, and the neglect, starvation and illusage of children; for dirt and disease of body and mind, for crime and disorder, for self-contempt and suicide.”

Surely there is no doubt as to the answer the Church of God must make to these questions. There is no room for compromise. Compromises may be for parties and parliament, but not for Churches. The duty of the Christian Church is plain—to decree the overthrow of the Drink Traffic, and speedily engage to sweep out of our land for ever an influence which not merely degrades the material and social life of the nation, but blinds the eyes of so many to the vision of God.

It will be contended by the Moderation League that the effort to regulate the liquor traffic is no longer a moral question, but an economic problem, the discussion of which does not belong to the pulpit. A former President of the Moderation League in Manitoba made the assertion that “The Church was the most dangerous organization the League had to face, and that the Church must be silenced on this question.” It is an interesting fact that the Churches in the City of Winnipeg, which refused to be silenced by the Moderation League, which on the contrary took the lead in opposing the proposals of the Moderation League, have not suffered, but have increased their membership, their financial standing, and their prestige in the community.

